

REMARKS

This is in reply to the Examiner's Official Action dated April 4, 2003. By this amendment, Applicants have amended the figures and claims 1-3, 6, and 7 to overcome the Examiner's objections and more appropriately define and claim the invention. The above amendment with the following remarks are submitted to be fully responsive to the Official Action. Reconsideration of this application in light of these remarks, and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

I. Drawings

The Examiner objected to Figs. 16-19C under M.P.E.P. § 608.02(g) and objected to the drawings for being improperly crosshatched.

In response to these objections and subject to the approval of the Examiner, Applicants have amended Figs. 2, 3, 5, 6, 10-13, and 15B to add the crosshatching requested by the Examiner, and amended Figs. 16, 17A, 17B, 18, 19A, 19B, and 19C to include the "Prior Art" designation. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the drawings.

II. Claim Objections

On page 2 of the Official Action, the Examiner objects to claims 1-3, 6, and 7 because of minor informalities. Applicants have amended claims 1-3, 6, and 7 to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. It is therefore asserted that claims 1-3, 6, and 7 are no longer objectionable. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his objections to claims 1-3, 6, and 7.

III. Rejection Of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

On page 3 of the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,068,500 to Kantner ("Kantner"). According to the Examiner, "Kantner discloses a card connector comprising: a pair of guide grooves (50, 52) formed on both sidewalls of a connector housing (14); and sidewalls (96) to define, below a space between the pair of guide grooves, a space." The Examiner further states that "[t]he recitations in the preamble have not been given patentable weight." (April 4, 2003, Official Action at page 3.)

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each and every claim limitation be disclosed by the applied reference. Kantner, however, does not teach a card connector having a base plate with a plurality of contact terminals adapted to electrically couple with contacts formed on the bottom surface of the first and second cards, as recited in amended claim 1. Instead, Kantner discloses that the first and second cards include contacts formed on a back surface. (See e.g., Figs. 2-7.) Therefore, the rejection of independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Kantner should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection Of Claims 3, 4 and 7-10 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On page 4 of the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kantner in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,231,360 to Horie ("Horie"). According to the Examiner:

Kantner discloses substantially the claimed invention except for the eject mechanism and the braking piece. Horie teaches a card connector having an ejector mechanism (11) and a braking piece (10) to help withdraw a card from the socket and provide a ground connection. Therefore, it would

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to from (sic) the card connector of Kantner having an ejector mechanism and a braking piece, as taught by Horie, to help withdraw a card from the socket and provide a ground connection.

(Id. at page 5.)

Claims 3, 4, and 7-10 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1. As previously mentioned, Kantner does not teach, suggest, or disclose all of the claim limitations of claim 1, and Horie fails to make up for the shortcomings of Kantner.

Since claims 3, 4, and 7-10 depend from claim 1, the rejection of those claims under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kantner in view of Horie should also be withdrawn.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest the Applicants' invention. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner deems that any issue remains after considering this response, however, he is invited to call the undersigned at 202-408-4157 to expedite the prosecution and work out any such issue by telephone.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this application is requested.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 4, 2003

By: 

Michael L. Woods
Reg. No. 50,811

Attachments: Replacement Drawing Sheets (14 pages, Figs. 1-19C)
Annotated Drawing Sheets (11 pages showing changes)

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com